UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2945
5 October 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 5 October 1990, at 3.30 p.m.

President:	Sir David HANNAY	(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. LI Daoyu
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Mr. TÖRNUDD
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. RAZALI
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. VORONTSOV
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Yemen	Mr. AL-ASHTAL
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-61206/A 1863V (E)

best copy available

The meeting was called to order at 4.30 p.m.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: As this is the first meeting of the Security Council for the month of October, I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute, on behalf of the Council and on my own behalf, to His Excellency Mr. Yuliy M. Vorontsov, Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations, for his extremely distinguished service during the month of September, when he had a time that was perhaps busier than he would have wished himself but when he certainly carried on the work of the Council with the very greatest distinction and set a standard which his successors in this place will find hard to match.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES

LETTER DATED 26 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMAMENT REPRESENTATIVE OF YEMEN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21830)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Israel and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bein (Israel) and Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 5 October 1990 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations, which has been issued as document S/21844, and which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request that, in accordance with its previous practice, the Security Council invite His Excellency Mr. Farouk Kaddoumi, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the State of Palestine and the head of the Political Department of the Palestine Liberation Organization, to participate in the current debate of the Security Council on the situation in the occupied Palestinian territory."

The request is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, but if it is approved the Council would invite the Head of the Political Department of the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate, not under rule 37 or rule 39, but with the same rights of participation as those conferred by rule 37.

Does any member of the Security Council wish to speak on this request?

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): First, Mr. President, since this is the first opportunity this month for me to address the Council in formal session, allow me to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency. I want to assure you that my delegation will do everything it can to assist you in pushing the Council's heavy work-load forward.

I would also like to commend and compliment last month's President, Ambassador Yuliy Vorontsov of the Soviet Union, for the exemplary way in which he performed under the extraordinary circumstances which the Council faced last month and to thank him in particular for the chairmanship of his Foreign Minister at the special ministerial meeting of the Council held last week.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

The United States, as it normally does when this question is considered, will request a vote on the proposal before the Security Council, and the United States will vote against it on two grounds. First, we believe that the Council does not have before it a valid request to speak. Secondly, the United States maintains that the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) should be granted permission to speak only if the request complies with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure. In our view, it is unwarranted and unwise for the Council to break with its own practice and rules.

As members of the Council, we should ask ourselves this question: Does a decision to break with our rules and procedures enlarge or diminish the Council's ability to play a constructive role in the Middle East peace process? My delegation firmly believes that it diminishes the Council's ability to play such a role.

As all members of the Council are aware, it is a long-established practice that observers do not have the right to speak in the Security Council at their own request. Rather, a request must be made on the observer's behalf by a Member State. My Government sees no justification for any departure from that practice. Further, there is nothing in resolutions recently adopted by the Assembly that would warrant a change in Security Council practice.

It is also clear that the General Assembly resolutions are not binding on the Security Council. General Assembly resolution 43/177, which purported to change the designation of the PLO Mission, did so

> "without prejudice to the observer status and functions of the Palestine Liberation Organization within the United Nations system, in conformity with relevant United Nations resolutions and practice."

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

That resolution does not constitute recognition of any State of Palestine. Like many other Members of the United Nations, the United States does not recognize such a State. The United States has consistently taken the position that, under the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, the only legal basis on which the Council may grant a hearing to persons speaking on behalf of non-governmental entities is rule 39. For four decades the United Staes has supported a generous interpretation of rule 39 and it would not have objected had this matter been appropriately raised under that rule. We are, however, opposed to special ad hoc departures from orderly procedure. The United States, consequently, opposes granting to the Palestine Liberation Organization the same rights to participate in the proceedings of the Security Council as if that organization represented a Member State of the United Nations.

We believe in listening to all points of view, but not in a manner that requires that we violate our rules. In particular, the United States does not agree with the recent practice of the Security Council that appears selectively to try to enhance the prestige and status of those who wish to speak in the Council through a departure from the rules of procedure. We consider this special practice to be without legal foundation and to constitute an abuse of the rules.

For all those reasons, the United States requests that the terms of the proposed invitation be put to the vote and, of course, the United States will vote against the proposal.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United States for the kind words he addressed to me.

If no other member of the Council wishes to speak at this stage, I shall take it that the Council is ready to vote on the request by Palestine.

It is so decided.

READEX FICHE

A vote was taken by a show of hands.

In favour: China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Finland, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Zaire

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Canada, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 11 votes in favour, 1 against and 3 abstentions. The request has been approved.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kaddoumi (Palestine) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 5 October 1990 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which reads as follows:

"In my capacity as Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, I have the honour to request that the delegation of the Committee be invited to participate in the forthcoming debate on the situation in the occupied Arab territories, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council."

On previous occasions, the Security Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In accordance with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the delegation of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

(The President)

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting today in response to the request contained in a letter dated 26 September 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Yemen to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, document S/21830.

I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following documents: S/21802, letter dated 19 September 1990 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the Secretary-General; S/21809, letter dated 21 September 1990 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; and S/21813, letter dated 24 September 1990 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

The first speaker is the representative of Palestine, on whom I now call.

Mr. KADDOUMI (Palestine) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. President, I should like to express to you and to the other members of the Council our thanks for inviting us to participate in your deliberations, which start today on the worsening situation in the occupied Palestinian territories. I also wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the current month. We are confident that your vast experience and extensive knowledge will enable the Council to address the issues under discussion successfully and effectively. In addition, I should like to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts in order to ensure international peace and security. I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, the Ambassador of the friendly country, the Soviet Union, for the wise and skilful manner in which he guided the deliberations of the Council during the past month.

(Mr. Kaddoumi, Palestine)

Today we discuss the question of Palestine, which has coexisted with the United Nations since the establishment of the world Organization. This world body has adopted scores of resolutions, the first of which was the resolution on the partition of Palestine in 1947 before the British Mandate on Palestine came to an end in 1948. Great Britain did not vote in favour of that resolution. Since then, for 42 long years, the journey of pain and agony, the diaspora of the Palestinian people, has continued. Our people saw aliens come to their land to take the land and settle in it when they did not represent, at the end of the British Mandate, more than 30 per cent of the total population of Palestine. That was because of the systematic Jewish immigration to Palestine during the years of the Second World War.

(Mr. Kaddoumi, Palestine)

The newcomers went only to Palestine, where, it was claimed, they sought refuge from massacres and suffering. The United Nations was committed to the implementation of the partition resolution, only to establish one State, namely Israel while the Arab State of Palestine was not established but was left to turn into a social problem that became an issue on the agenda of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). It emerged as a political issue on the agenda of the United Nations only twenty-five years later, when the Palestinian revolution brought it squarely before the world Organization.

This means that the question of Palestine has all the vital makings of a burning issue, despite all the attempts to suppress it or alter its political essence. Objectively and in the light of scientific analysis of the social and political developments in the Middle East, we now see that the active elements of change and development inherent in the question of Palestine have an impact that reaches far beyond the geographical location. To put it more clearly, let me say that the question of Palestine possesses, in the national context, all the elements of Arab strength together with all the elements of spiritual power in the religious Islamic and Christian context. On top of all that, it has a solid foundation of international consensus which derives from the justice of its cause.

This shows clearly that the Middle East crisis, with all its wars and conflicts, is the result of a deep sense of frustration at the failure to address the question of Palestine, the real core of the crisis. The instability and persistent tension we now witness, including the burning crises in the Gulf and in Lebanon, clearly prove my point.

If we are to address the problems arising from that situation, in a spirit compatible with the international orientation towards détente and the desire to

(Mr. Kaddoumi, Palestine)

settle regional conflicts peacefully, then logic dictates that we should address the question of Palestine properly and put it in the proper perspective.

To disregard this core problem will only pose continued threats to peace and stability throughout the Middle East, and consequently, the world will continue to be greatly disturbed and concerned. Eventually, this will lead to a destructive war in the region; the Gulf crisis makes this plain.

Let us consider this volatile region which possesses some 60 per cent of the world's reserves of that inflammable strategic material, oil. Let us opt for prudence and rationality, shrug off the temptations of the logic of the arrogance of power, and discuss the issue with the purpose of finding a solution that would satisfy all mankind and set at ease its troubled conscience.

Elusive visions of victory and the upper hand should not delude anyone. The ongoing world-wide campaign of polarization could result in a slide towards a destructive war that would cause massive harm to all mankind.

Let me, on the basis of first-hand experience, stress that unless we address the question of Palestine in a serious and responsible manner, there will be no way of finding a solution that would restore security and stability to the Middle East region, which has been the scene of too many wars over the past few decades.

We should take account of the fact that the escalation of tension in occupied Palestine and the deterioration of the security situation there, tend to make it exceedingly difficult to find any viable solutions to other problems. Therefore, there must be a serious effort to address the question of Palestine.

Israel occupies the territory of Palestine. For scores of years, it has practised the worst types of brutality, terrorism and oppression against the Palestinian people. And yet, in the face of all that, the Security Council has failed to protect the Palestinian people or safeguard their national rights of

(Mr. Kaddoumi, Palestine)

independence and sovereignty, because of Israel's intransigence and its defiance of the international will under the cover of the United States veto. That veto has stopped the Council from deterring Israel's policies and prevented the imposition of any sanctions on Israel.

Meanwhile, the massacre of the Palestinians continues. On the 20th of last May, Israel added the massacres of Rishon le-Zion - Ein Kara - to its black record, and a few days ago yet another massacre was added to the list: It was perpetrated in the Bureij refugee camp in the Gaza district. Advantage was taken of the preoccupation of the United Nations with the Gulf crisis.

Today, the world views with optimism the prevalent orientation towards a new world order that would be based on respect for legitimacy, the right of peoples to self-determination, respect for human rights and the elimination of occupation and brutal hegemony. Against that backdrop, it is our hope that the question of Palestine will be given access to that new climate and, like all other issues, will be addressed in the same spirit that has led to the recent developments in southern Africa and the triumph of freedom in heroic Namibia.

(Mr. Kaddoumi, Palestine)

The journey to peace in the region can not but start from Palestine. The members of the Security Council must be committed to the implementation of the Council's resolutions. The Council has adopted numerous resolutions which have not been implemented because of the double standards applied by the United States of America in its approach to Security Council resolutions. It is high time for the Council to have a single, universal standard that applies to all. There should be no more resolutions that are adopted for the sole purpose of verbal consumption, while others are adopted to be implemented with great vigour.

Accordingly, we sincerely call on the Council to make every effort to implement its previous resolutions on the question of Palestine, to take the necessary measures to protect our people from the annihilation that threatens them, and put an end once and for all to the Israeli occupation and all Israel's inhuman practices, so that the Palestinian people may finally exercise their legitimate right to self-determination and a life of freedom, peace and dignity in their own homeland, Palestine.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Palestine for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): Allow me at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency for this month. We are confident that with your vast experience you will guide the Council's work towards success.

I should also like to thank the Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union for the exemplary manner in which he guided the Council's work last month, when its meetings culminated in the meeting of Foreign Ministers.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

The delegation of Yemen requested the convening of this meeting to deal with the recent developments in Gaza. The letter of the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations (S/21809) gives the details of those developments, which involved injuries inflicted upon 180 Palestinians and the detention of 200 others aged between 12 and 45, as well as the demolition of 50 homes and the expulsion of more than half the Palestinian population of the Boreij refugee camp.

Developments of that sort are part and parcel of the very well known practices of Israel. However, the most significant features of the present situation in the Arab territories is the continued Israeli occupation, in contravention of the Security Council resolution which called for the withdrawal of the Israeli forces, the continued Israeli control over the occupied Arab territories, the annexation of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, and the systematic Israeli policy of deportation, which will lead, without a doubt, to a major confrontation in the near future.

Some may find it strange that this meeting has been convened at this time, when the events in question may not seem important in comparison with the major crisis in the Gulf. Some may even feel that all eyes should be on the lookout for a solution to that regrettable crisis. However, we say that in view of this renewed crisis which besets the region we are required to demonstrate the Council's credibility in dealing with all its resolutions.

We wish on this occasion to bring the Palestinian question directly out into the open, after the numerous attempts to obliterate the Palestinian cause or ignore it. That is why we have called for this meeting and why we shall, at a later time, submit a draft resolution dealing with Israel's recent practices and forthrightly calling upon Israel to abide by the Geneva Convention and upon the Secretary-General to make an effort to protect the Palestinians.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

Although the events of which I have spoken may seem simple, they do put the Security Council to the test. Can the Council implement all its resolutions with the same diligence, enthusiasm and commitment? The Arab peoples as a whole, at a time of undoubted crisis, because of the Gulf crisis, must look askance at this meeting and yearn for some explanation, because, for one reason or another, the Council, for many years, has failed to find a solution to the Palestinian question and the Arab-Israeli conflict. Therefore, this meeting, though it deals with a specific issue, puts the Security Council face to face with the most important question: how will the Council deal with the Arab-Israeli conflict?

We believe that within a few weeks or perhaps a few months the Council will be dutybound to deal with the implementation of resolution 242 (1967), seriously consider convening the international peace conference on the Middle East, and, if necessary, seek the imposition of all types of sanctions in order to implement its resolutions.

The Council's credibility is at stake; if the Council does not act cohesively and consistently on all questions, we shall rightly think that there is in fact a double standard and that issues are not dealt with evenhandedly.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

In view of all this, we hope that the Security Council will not stand by as a spectator and watch what is happening in the occupied Arab territories from afar. It is enough that four decades have already passed and that such a grave crisis remains unresolved to this day.

I might also add that the new international relations and the new international climate, which are connected with the solution of the Gulf crisis, are also connected with the solution of the Palestinian question.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Yemen for his kind words addressed to me.

Before the meeting began, it was agreed that at this point I would suspend the meeting for a short time. I shall call on the next speaker inscribed on my list, the representative of Israel, when the meeting resumes, at 6 o'clock.

The meeting was suspended at 5.10 p.m. and resumed at 6.25 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Israel. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. BEIN (Israel): It is a personal pleasure for me to be able to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October. I have no doubt that your wealth of diplomatic experience will be of invaluable importance during the coming days and weeks. I should like also to congratulate Ambassador Yuliy Vorontsov on the outstanding way in which he conducted the affairs of the Security Council last month.

One cannot but applaud the staunch resolve, the decisive action and the political astuteness demonstrated by the Security Council over the last two months in the struggle against Iraqi aggression. The Security Council has attained unprecedented unity, enabling it to be the standard-bearer in the global drive to face up to the aggressor.

The united response, however, has not been unanimous. Two dissenting members of the Security Council were the exceptions. They often were the spoilers in the work of the Council. One of them has requested the convening of today's meeting at the urging of the PLO. The PLO has many motives for convening this emergency meeting of the Security Council. Not one of them is justified by objective criteria.

By way of tradition, popularity in the Middle East is best attained, if only momentarily, by the nostrum of anti-Israel mobilization. The PLO has become adept at attracting attention to itself either by committing spectacular acts of terror that snatch the headlines or by theatrics before the Security Council. Excommunicated by many of the Arab States, the PLO has been scurrying to stave off their wrath. Diverting attention from its open alliance in collusion with

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

Saddam Hussein's aggression is the first motive for the PLO's headlong rush to the Security Council.

We need not look far in search of the second motive. It too is a matter of tradition. Convening the Security Council as a primer for the General Assembly's November debates on the Middle East is an inveterate ritual of the PLO. Every October and early November without fail, the PLO and its supporters manage to unearch one flimsy excuse or another and rush with it to the Security Council. These histrionics are played out like clockwork, serving as the curtain-raiser for the PLO, an occasion on which to prepare public opinion for its upcoming repertoire.

All of us know perfectly well where the real conflict is being waged. The red herring which is dangled before us by the Saddam Hussein retinue is too transparent to be taken seriously.

A variant of the Big Lie is the Big Diversion. This is the third reason for today's meeting. To say that Saddam Hussein and Yasser Arafat would like to deflect some of the heat which has cost them dearly in their public-relations accomplishments would be an understatement. They would much prefer to revert to the listless routine of pointing at Israel as the black sheep, the source of all the maladies in the Middle East. No matter how strenuous their efforts, however, aside from being the favoured target of Iraqi threats of mass destruction, Israel has as much to do with the maelstrom in the Gulf as the hot weather in Kuwait City.

More pernicious is the PLO attempt to sow division and disunity in the ranks of the international coalition mustered against the Iraqi aggression. The incessant prodding for cracks in the fortification raised against Saddam Hussein is manifesting itself on many levels, among them the convening of the Security Council today. This point was expressed most bluntly by a senior French Foreign Ministry official:

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

"... one does not have to be a genius to figure out what they are up to, which is to divide the solid front facing them". (The New York Times, 2 October 1990, p. A13)

What better way to send this international coalition into a tail-spin than by shoving Israel to the fore, thereby throwing a monkey-wrench into the workings of the solid front opposing Iraq and halting it in its tracks.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

To put it mildly, the waning months of summer 1990 proved to be the PLO's undoing. If the world reacted with shock to Saddam Hussein's unprovoked onslaught on Kuwait, it reacted with revulsion to the prolonged embrace with Yasser Arafat four days later. It is noteworthy that the bête noire of the Arab press these days, over and above Saddam Hussein, is Yasser Arafat. The lavish hugging and kissing incensed many commentators in Arab States, and provoked an outpouring of anti-PLO invective. To illustrate:

> "With a face full of joy and with anxious eyes, Arafat ... rubbed his face in Saddam's shoulders as if he was blessing himself with the Great God and the great hero ... Saddam Hussein liked this and began to pat ... (Arafat's) back ... as if he was being nice to a small boy eager for a piece of chocolate".

The pundit concluded his column with these words:

> "We beseech God to save this nation from its heroes."

One newspaper in the United Arab Emirates had this to say to Arafat:

> "There are some 400,000 Palestinians in Kuwait who, through your stand on the occupation of Kuwait, you have tried to incite and spur ... You have tried to spread sedition, which is asleep. God damn him who stirs up seditions."

According to Al Khalij of Abu Dhabi, the

> "PLO's attitude towards the Gulf crisis is shameful and scandalous ...".

The paper also accused the PLO of terrorizing

> ""anyone who tries to object to its policy (or) to criticize its practices."

Another columnist wrote:

> "Arafat ... was the first to fly out to Baghdad to embrace Saddam Hussein."

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

The writer wonders what accounted for Arafat's exuberance, asking

"was the invasion of Kuwait the first step paving the way to the invasion of Israel, burning half of the Israeli people and throwing the rest into the sea?"

And that is an Arab paper!

That question was prompted by the PLO's instantaneous support for Saddam Hussein's aggression. A now famous message was cabled to Saddam Hussein by the PLO Unified National Leadership on 2 August, following the invasion of Kuwait:

"March ahead with God's blessings, O leader. We, the eagles of the Palestinian revolution, are at leader Saddam Hussein's beck and call. May God bless you, O inspired leader Saddam, you have just taken the first step towards the liberation of Palestine."

The outcry was not long in coming. One Arab paper had this to say on 6 August:

"This is the first time we have heard that the thorny road to the liberation of Palestine runs through another Arab State, and that this road involves an invasion by Arabs, using Arab weapons, and treading on the dead bodies of other Arabs, before reaching Israel."

These sharp reactions resulted from the shock and astonishment experienced by many of the PLO's erstwhile supporters, in Arab States as around the world.

To Israel, however, none of this was surprising. The deadly threat issued on 1 April 1990 by Saddam Hussein to burn half of Israel with chemical arms has been echoed by Arafat throughout the year. Touting his mentor as the "prince", Arafat increasingly issued public calls for the use of the Iraqi missiles against Israel.

Addressing a public rally in Baghdad on 29 March 1990, while standing beside Saddam Hussein, Arafat declared that both leaders would enter Jerusalem victoriously, with Saddam mounted on a white horse, fighting Israel with stones,

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

rifles and the El-Abed - Iraq's long-range missile. That was reported by the Associated Press on 29 March.

It came as no surprise, then, that in pro-Iraqi demonstrations following the invasion of Kuwait, PLO activists called on the Iraqi ruler to "Gas the Zionists", "Strike Tel Aviv" or "Do it with gas, O Saddam".

It came as no surprise that Baghdad became the new focal point of international terrorism, hosting thousands of Fatah men, from Force 17 to the Waddia Haddad group, together with the usual PLO and ex-PLO entourage, such as Abu Nidal, Abu Abbas, the DFLP, the PFLP, the May 15 Organization, the Arab Liberation Front, and so on.

Nor were we astounded by the words of the Achille Lauro killer, Arafat's right hand man, Abu Abbas. Sitting in his refurbished Baghdad office, surrounded by photographs of his speedboats on a mission to commit mass murder on Israeli beaches, Abu Abbas declared - listen to this - that the invasion of Kuwait was the battle for Palestine.

Abu Abbas made sure that the message of PLO defiance of Security Council resolutions was received loud and clear. Interviewed on ABC News just three days ago, Abbas declared:

> "If the United States intercepts Iraqi planes in compliance with the air blockade, we will also intercept American planes. If the United States brings down an Iraqi plane, we will bring down an American plane."

Another great PLO humanitarian, George Habash of the PFLP, warned:

> "We have a finger on the trigger and we will pull it the moment Baghdad or any other part of Iraqi territory is attacked."

He did not forget to add that "Kuwait is part of Iraq".

To Israel, none of this is surprising. The PLO metamorphosis was, and remains, an optical illusion.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

For those who genuinely ponder on the logic of PLO actions, Arafat has an explanation. This is what he said on 4 September 1990:

"Where does Israel stand in this confrontation? ... We can only be in the trench hostile to Zionism and its imperialist allies."

The PLO would like us to forget all this. Arafat would like the Arab press to get off his back; he would like Arab States to cease their excommunication of the PLO; he would like to quell anti-Palestinian sentiments provoked by him throughout the region; he would like to stop Arab States from expelling more PLO officials; and he would like them to continue furnishing the billions of dollars now withheld from him.

This accounts for the "Big Diversion". For these reasons, we find ourselves in the Security Council today.

But there is more. In the streets of Sidon in Lebanon Arafat has been struggling to wrest control of the refugee camps. Community leaders in Sidon have called publicly for the expulsion of all the Palestinians there after hundreds of residents were killed in a brutal internecine free-for-all. It seems as if things are getting out of hand.

But there is still more. In the territories administered by Israel terror has been unleashed in the cities, towns and villages. In the last two years over 300 Palestinians have been murdered by PLO death squads. Others have been killed in the inter-factional melee between the PLO's Fatah and Hamas and just about every other Palestinian group boasting of card-carrying members. Why? Because the PLO dislikes not being listened to.

Not by coincidence, the idea of holding democratic elections among the Palestinians, as floated by Israel in its peace initiative, has terribly agitated the PLO.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

From then on, Palestinians began disappearing at night, and they disappeared for good. The rate of killings has increased markedly in recent months, provoking an outcry by Hamas - the other "sole legitimate representative" - which is now declaring publicly that the PLO's Fatah has declared an intifadah against the Palestinians on all their factions. It definitely seems as if this is not Arafat's day under the sun.

The factors I have mentioned account for the convening of this meeting of the Security Council. Since the reason given by the PLO is the situation in the territories, let us take a brief look at what the situation really is.

While the internecine violence is stepped up by the PLO, other facets of the unrest have long diminished as Israel's policy of restraint has brought about a drastic reduction in the level of violence. The decreased military presence, the policy of reducing points of friction with the local population, the strict rules of engagement and the unwillingness on the part of the Palestinian population to follow the dictates of the PLO are the factors that have alleviated tensions and contributed to a more peaceful atmosphere. The situation in the territories has not deteriorated. On the contrary, the situation is more peaceful than at any other point in time since December 1987.

Confidence-building measures on the part of Israeli authorities have been manifold, including the release of hundreds of detainees, the reopening of all primary and secondary schools, including 16 colleges and three universities, assistance in the promotion of agricultural exports from the territories, expanding the banking system and increasing social welfare projects.

Israel has facilitated the holding of local elections among the local professional associations and continues a policy of holding numerous meetings between Israel's Defence Minister and prominent Palestinian leaders.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

At a time when the Gulf States are expelling Palestinians by the thousands in retaliation for the PLO's role in the Gulf crisis, it is Israel which is facilitating the entry of fleeing Palestinians while providing assistance to stranded Kuwaiti refugees. Strangely, Palestinians are streaming into the administered territories, fleeing from the very man the PLO has hailed as their saviour.

The calm prevailing in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza district is perceived by Yasser Arafat as a direct threat to the PLO. The PLO is working frantically to breathe new life into the moribund unrest by goading, fomenting and instigating more violence solely in order to keep itself in the limelight and shore up its slipping grip on the international agenda. It is for this reason that the PLO prays for blood-shedding, like a farmer prays for rain, no matter what the outrage involved or the cost to the people it purports to represent.

A terrible murder was committed on 20 September 1990. Like hundreds of thousands of other Israeli civilians, Amnon Pomerantz was called up for his annual reserve duty. At the time of the incident which led to his violent death, he was driving in a civilian car, dressed in civilian clothes, with no marking to indicate that he was a reserve soldier. He took a wrong turn into the el-Bureij refugee camp, in the Gaza district. This was to be his fatal mistake. He was attacked by a lynch mob. Hundreds of people encircled the car, hurling stones and blocks. The car was doused with kerosene and set on fire. The auto-da-fé lasted for 10 long minutes as the crowd watched Amnon Pomerantz burn alive.

Not one local resident came to his aid. The only voice of humanity was that of an UNRWA employee who tried to persuade the mob to spare the victim's life. In tears, she provided the following eyewitness account: "I could not stop them. They threatened me, saying 'If you get in our way you will die with the Jew'."

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

The PLO, of course, did not provide the Council with an account of this despicable murder. This omission is part of a long tradition dating back to the 1960s and 1970s. It amounts to this: "Please do not focus on the murderers; focus your wrath instead on the response."

The outrage in el-Bureij reminds one of the biblical account of Sodom and Gomorrah: "And the Lord said, if I find in Sodom 50 righteous within the city, then I will spare all the place for their sakes." There was not one righteous man to be found in el-Bureij.

Israel has been pursuing a policy of utmost restraint in the administered territories, precisely in order to ensure that the situation does not deteriorate. We are working to advance Israel's peace initiative. For this reason we are doing everything in our power to create an atmosphere conducive to democratic elections and coexistence. The PLO, of course, is doing everything in its power to kill this process.

Following the murder in el-Bureij, the Israel Defence Forces decided to expedite existing plans to broaden the road on which the incident occurred. The camp has long been a hotbed of agitation, while the portion of the road at the entrance to the camp has been the scene of numerous attacks in the past. Certain segments of the road were broadened for clear-cut security reasons, to ensure that such lynchings are not repeated.

Since this was not a punitive action, the owners of the stores and buildings that had to be demolished will receive full financial compensation. The owners were not associated with the murder. Twenty-six stores and seven residential buildings were demolished. PLO allegations that 200 houses are to be demolished are preposterous.

We continue to pursue a policy of utmost restraint even in the wake of the el-Bureij incident. PLO claims of collective punishment are ill-intentioned and

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

unfounded. No collective punitive actions were used. The figures provided by the PLO as to the number of houses demolished and the number of people imprisoned are a figment of its imagination.

Punitive action has been taken against two individuals involved in the murder. Their houses were sealed in accordance with the ruling of Israel's High Court of Justice. They have been given the right to appeal. Thirteen individuals confessed to taking part in the lynching and remain in custody.

(Mr. Bein, Israel)

While the PLO dickers deceptively with figures, the sword of Damocles is hanging over us.

Saddam Hussein has threatened to launch a first strike against Israel in retaliation for resolutions adopted by the Security Council. The Council must not allow itself to be lulled by the Big Diversion contrived by the PLO.

Israel stands vigilant in the face of the Iraqi threat. For the first time in history, gas masks are being distributed to the population of an entire nation. Israel is taking very high risks out of consideration for the interests of the international coalition opposing Saddam Hussein. Israel's low-profile policy stands in glaring contradiction to the high profile now being pursued by the PLO.

Yet Israel does not stand alone. The world has mobilized as one to fend off Saddam Hussein. It is Iraq that stands alone. While a terrible war may be unleashed at any moment, the Council is being made to waste precious time on PLO theatrics. The grave threat to international peace and security is not the situation in el-Bureij, but Saddam Hussein and his weapons of mass destruction.

The message that the Council must convey to Saddam Hussein and his flunkey should be made loud and clear: the Security Council will not be diverted from the crucial task that still lies before it.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Israel for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next name inscribed on the list of speakers is that of Her Excellency Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo, Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, to whom the Security Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

Mrs. DIALLO (Senegal), Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (interpretation from French): I am very pleased to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October. We are sure that, thanks to your broad experience and your great diplomatic talents, the Council's deliberations will be very successful. I take this occasion also to extend our warmest congratulations to your predecessor, Ambassador Yuliy Vorontsov of the USSR, on the exemplary way in which he led the Council's work in September.

Finally, I wish to thank all the members of the Security Council for allowing me, as Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, to take part once again in an important discussion of the situation in the occupied Palestinian territory.

Since the intifadah began almost three years ago, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has repeatedly drawn the Security Council's attention to the ever-increasing deterioration of the situation in the Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem, occupied by Israel since 1967, and has expressed its deepest concern over the occupying Power's recourse to armed force and the most brutal repression.

According to information published by several human rights organizations, Israel has intensified its acts of violence against and persecution of Palestinian civilians, making massive use of tear-gas and inflicting inhuman corporal punishment on those detained.

(Mrs. Diallo, Chairman, Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People)

Given the repeated attacks perpetrated by the Israeli armed forces on these persons, it was inconceivable that the Israeli Government would have the audacity to condone and even encourage such violence. But, blinded by the desire to crush the intifadah, it has on the contrary eased the restrictions on the use of firearms - closing its eyes to the many abuses which have been committed and observed.

This unspeakable attitude has resulted in the death of 856 Palestinians in the period between the beginning of the intifadah and 31 August 1990. It is estimated that 99,150 Palestinians have been wounded. Moreover, there has been an alarming, rapid deterioration in the situation of children. Indeed, there has been a terrible toll: 217 children younger than the age of 16 - that is, 25 per cent of the total - have been killed during the intifadah.

The Israeli occupation authorities continue to have recourse to collective punishment and Draconian measures - deportations, massive arrests, detention, raids on houses and villages, prolonged curfews, confiscation of property, destruction of vegetation and crops, and so forth. This is a flagrant and inadmissible violation of the relevant principles and provisions of international law, and more particularly of the Fourth Geneva Convention, of 12 August 1949, relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.

In addition, since the beginning of the intifadah a total of 10,200 Palestinians have been placed in administrative detention, without any formal charges; and no normal judicial proceedings are contemplated. It is estimated that 60,000 Palestinians have been imprisoned during the intifadah, not to speak of the large number of cases of torture and ill-treatment of political detainees.

(Mrs. Diallo, Chairman, Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People)

Moreover, on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip, 7,755 days of curfew have been imposed on hundreds of thousands of Palestinians; 1,577 houses and other buildings had been demolished or sealed by 31 August 1990. Only last week, at least 49 houses and shops were destroyed in the Bureij camp in the Gaza Strip. During the same period, there has been an increasing number of illegal and violent acts by Israeli settlers, in the form of attacks against individuals, raids on Palestinian villages and quarters, vandalism and, what is even worse, desecration of Muslim religious sites.

This violent repression has been compounded by the violation of the Palestinian community's most fundamental social, economic and cultural rights. In this regard, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has indicated that the entire Palestinian educational system has been paralysed by the closing of teaching institutions since the beginning of the intifadah.

(Mrs. Diallo, Chairman, Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People)

No doubt, some institutions have been reopened, but the Israeli occupation authorities continue, as a matter of collective punishment, to interfere seriously with their functioning, by ordering military operations in educational institutions - raids on their buildings, firing upon students, arrests, arbitrary closure of such institutions, or closures following curfews, and other actions. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East has stated in this regard that Israeli intervention is preventing it from providing education under satisfactory conditions for children of Palestinian refugees and from making optimum use of public funds provided for that purpose.

The World Health Organization has, for its part, stated that the health situation in the occupied Palestinian territory, in particular in the Gaza Strip, remains deplorable and has deteriorated steadily since the beginning of the intifadah. Access to medical care, the supply of water, road and other necessary services have been subjected to restrictions, such as repeated and prolonged curfews, imposed by the occupation authorities. In view of the large number of persons wounded during the intifadah, medical services, already insufficient, are reported to have been completely overwhelmed. It has also been stated that those wounded were often deprived of care for hours on end during their arbitrary detention at police or army installations. These facts have often been aggravated by frequent raids made by Israeli troops at clinics, where they grievously maltreated the patients.

The International Labour Organisation has emphasized that there has been no improvement in working and living conditions for Palestinian workers and their families. The military occupation and the substantial obstacles encountered in the agricultural, industrial and other areas continue to impede the economic development of the occupied territory.

(Mrs. Diallo, Chairman, Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People)

Since the beginning of the intifadah in December 1987, the Security Council has been endeavouring unsuccessfully to find ways of ensuring protection for the Palestinians. The Council has not followed up on the Secretary-General's report submitted in January 1988, which contained very useful and constructive recommendations and observations. Several draft resolutions submitted by the group of non-aligned countries during previous debates on this question, the most recent of which took place in May 1990 at Geneva, have not been adopted.

In the face of this situation, I believe it essential to emphasize vigorously once again the primary responsibility of the Security Council, which, as the body serving as the guarantor of international peace and security, must without further delay take adequate and firm steps to make Israel comply with its obligations and duties as an occupying Power, pursuant to the relevant provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949. The Committee believes that it is now time for the High Contracting Parties to that Convention, supported by all Members of our Organization, to compel Israel to live up fully to its responsibilities. For that reason, the Committee wishes to urge the Security Council to set up, as a matter of urgency, an appropriate system capable of ensuring the effective protection of the population in the occupied territories.

We are convinced that only scrupulous respect by Israel for the provisions of that international legal instrument will make it possible to restore order and tranquillity in that area, where the heroic Palestinian people is fighting with courage and determination to regain its national identity and rid itself of the yoke of a long and unjust domination.

In our view, order, tranquillity and, above all, security are the objectives which immediate United Nations action should be aimed at, not only to safeguard the

(Mrs. Diallo, Chairman, Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People)

interests of the Palestinian people in the occupied territory, but also, and especially, to enable the Palestinian people to exercise freely its inalienable national rights, including the right to self-determination and independence.

The attainment of these objectives also has the major advantage of paving the way for the establishment of a climate leading to negotiation, an indispensable stage in the quest for an overall political settlement of the Middle East crisis, and in particular of the Palestinian problem.

The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People believes that in spite of the alarming events in the Gulf region, the international community must continue to give special attention to the question of Palestine, so that a speedy and happy solution for its present political and diplomatic deadlock may be found.

I take this opportunity, on behalf of the Committee and of my country, Senegal, to reiterate once more our firm conviction that such a settlement inevitably requires the convening, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East, in which the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, would participate on an equal footing with other participants.

The current situation in the Gulf region, during which the Council has shown that it was able to take a clear position in favour of justice and legality, is evidence that with political will a consensus can be obtained on important issues, such as that of Palestine, which are of concern to the international community in the area of peace and security.

For that reason, we urge the Security Council to consider the question of Palestine with the same sense of urgency and the same determination, in order to

(Mrs. Diallo, Chairman, Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People)

achieve a just and lasting solution of that conflict. In that connection, the Committee has taken note with great interest of the declaration of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the five permanent members of the Security Council following talks they held with the Secretary-General.

It is reassuring to note that they expressed their serious concern over the aggravation of tensions in the Middle East and, above all, reaffirmed their determination to support an active negotiation process in which all parties concerned would participate, with a view to achieving a global, just and lasting peace.

It is also good to find that they recalled that those negotiations must, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), take into account the rights of all States in the region, including Israel, and the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

The Committee and Senegal welcome that declaration and hope that it will motivate the Security Council, so that a satisfactory and definitive solution of the question of Palestine may finally be found.

The Security Council, which in the case of the Gulf crisis has just set the world a fine lesson of firmness in working for the triumph of legality and justice, can no longer justifiably allow the Palestinian people to be denied its inalienable national rights.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People for the kind words addressed to me.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. President, allow me first of all to express my delegation's satisfaction at seeing you presiding over the work of this Council for this month. Already, in the few days during which you have been performing this noble task, you have demonstrated qualities which have inspired the admiration and respect of all the members and make us confident that under your guidance the Council will be able to deal successfully with the important problems before it. I should like also to congratulate Ambassador Vorontsov on the exemplary manner in which he guided the work of the Council last month.

It was not the intention of my delegation to speak this afternoon - and in view of the lateness of the hour I shall be brief - but we felt it was an elementary duty to express our gratitude to the representative of Israel for the very revealing statement he made here this afternoon.

On the one hand, he complained that every October or November representatives of Palestine feel obliged to draw the attention of the Security Council to the situation prevailing in that region. In point of fact he could have been a little more precise and mentioned also the months of February, March and June - in fact any of the 12 months of the year - since we all know that throughout virtually all the years in which the Organization has existed, at any time, in any month, the Council has had before it in one way or another the serious situation prevailing in that region. In particular, for 23 years now, since the time when the subject of the occupation of Arab territories by Israel came up, it has been constantly on our agenda.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

On the other hand, it would seem, as we listened to him, that the Palestinian conflict or the occupation of Arab territories began on 2 August 1990, because his whole statement was devoted apparently to giving us a lesson about the efforts that one might make to divert the Council's attention to other matters. I am very grateful he has made this statement, using modern didactical methods and giving us the practical experience of how one can make a major effort to divert the attention of the Council. His statement should be the object of study by future diplomats, who will see how, without anyone's having forced him - since I think I understood from what he said that he had asked to take part in this debate - he came here to give the Council lessons in how one may attempt to distract this body from an important subject before it for consideration.

At the end of his statement he took a glance at that part of the world that he calls the "territories". He did not even use the time-honoured adjective that we have used in the Council, "occupied" territories. He tried to distract the Council's attention with regard to the events that are occurring there, particularly the events that have occurred during the past three years, during which the Palestinian people has been involved in a heroic uprising to defend its national rights.

Ambassador Diallo, in her brilliant statement on behalf of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, has most appropriately summed up the real situation that exists in that country. One does not need to use any further arguments to refute the pointless claims of the Tel Aviv representative. I just wanted to place on record my gratitude to him because indeed we did need a demonstration of why some of us representatives have been justified in expressing our concern about some decisions that this Council might adopt, will adopt or has adopted, which could indicate a lack of consistency

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

regarding the need to implement at all times and everywhere elementary principles that are at the very basis of our Organization.

He was generous enough to come here this afternoon to show how right we were, we who expressed our concern - a concern that we reiterate now - that if this Council is not consistent in adopting a uniform attitude in defence of principles and in ensuring that its resolutions are really implemented, the effect can only be to encourage the aggressor, to encourage those who violate norms of international law and try to hide behind this lack of consistency in order to perpetuate their aggression. I am grateful to him for his enlightening statement, and I am also grateful to you, Mr. President, and my colleagues for listening to me now.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Cuba for his kind words with regard to my occupation of the Chair.

The representative of Palestine has asked to be allowed to speak, and I call on him.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine): We have asked for the floor to set the record straight. It was claimed by the representative of Israel that the figures quoted in our letter to you and to the Secretary-General were exaggerated. Perhaps he is right - I do not know - but let me quote here from a statement issued by the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, who visited the El-Bureij camp in Gaza. In it he reports:

> "A large number of families had been made homeless by the demolitions. Nineteen refugee homes and about as many shops had been demolished. Another house had been demolished and one house sealed on punitive grounds. UNRWA's Gaza field office reported that 23 camp families, totalling some 129 persons, had been notified by the authorities that their houses were to be demolished."

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

So there is a difference between 19 plus 19 - which makes almost 40 - and the 50 mentioned in our letter. We really regret that, but sometimes our counting may not be quite correct. However, the fact is that there was some demolition. This demolition did not just happen on the spur of the moment. According to the daily news bulletin of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Israel's High Court of Justice authorized the army to proceed with the demolition of houses in the Gaza Strip refugee camp of El-Bureij. A three-judge panel accepted the argument of Major-General Mattan Vilnai, Israel's Defence Force commander in the southern region, that demolition was "an urgent and immediate military need rather than a punitive measure".

I really cannot tell the difference, in the demolition of 19 plus 19 houses and shops, between what is really a military need and what is a punitive measure. Of course I am not a militarist, and I am not a judge or an officer in charge of the maintenance of law. So I do not know what a punitive measure is and what a military need is. This same general said that the army urgently needed to widen that section of road as a security measure, not as a punishment. He added that the immediacy of the action was vital to restoration of the entire Gaza Strip, and he added also that he must act as swiftly as possible - a traumatic act demands immediate action.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

But what was the traumatic act he was talking about? Again according to the daily news bulletin of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency,

"Sergeant Pomeranz had received telephone instructions to reach a military outpost in the Gaza Strip, where he had not been before. He turned off the main road to follow" -

and this demands particular attention -

"a sign pointing to his destination, only to find himself in the crowded El Bureij marketplace."

So, he followed a sign pointing to his destination and ended up in El Bureij marketplace.

"His car, made conspicuous by its yellow Israeli license plates" -

in Israel, you see, they discriminate: the Israelis have a colour and non-Israeli Jews have another colour, which reminds us of the armbands people used to wear during the Nazi period in Europe. But that is a totally different subject.

"Sergeant Pomeranz's car was made conspicuous by its yellow Israeli license-plates and was instantly pelted by stones. Pomeranz threw the car into reverse and tried to back out, when he struck a donkey cart, injuring two Arab children riding in it."

The report goes on:

"Investigators are troubled by several aspects of the case. They want to know why Pomeranz was not stopped at the heavily guarded Eretz Checkpoint at the entrance to the Gaza Strip. Pomeranz, though driving a civilian car, was in uniform and alone."

Again, we have heard that he was in civilian clothes, but the daily news bulletin of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency says that Pomeranz was in uniform and alone. Yet he was waved through the checkpoint.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

So, when we thought that all this dramatization was an act designed to provoke an incident, we were not mistaken. I just wanted to make this clarification of the crime planned by the Israelis themselves, because one still recalls what occurred in the village of Beita, where a 15-year-old Israeli hiker was shot to death, again by another Israeli guard, and 15 homes in the area were demolished.

That is why we believe that the Council should immediately act to stop such criminal acts by the occupying Power, first on humanitarian grounds and, secondly, on legal grounds - and precisely on the grounds of the obligation to ensure respect for the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention.

The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers inscribed on my list for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place on Monday, 8 October, at 3 p.m.

The meeting rose at 7.25 p.m.